

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

**JOANNE STONE**

**CIVIL ACTION**

**VERSUS**

**NO. 12-2182**

**LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF  
REVENUE**

**SECTION I**

**ORDER AND REASONS**

Before the Court is a motion<sup>1</sup> to seal this case filed by plaintiff, Joanne Stone. Plaintiff believes that the record of the existence of this lawsuit “is preventing [her] from employment, getting jobs and working.”<sup>2</sup> She requests that the Court seal the entire record of this case to prevent these perceived effects and because “[c]onfidential information exists in the files.”<sup>3</sup>

There is “a strong public interest in maintaining accurate records in civil cases” and “in free and open access to court documents.” *McGough v. Corrections Corp. of Am.*, No. 1:07-0039, 2008 WL 313064, at \*3 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 1, 2008) (denying motion to expunge defendant’s name from civil lawsuit so defendant would not have to disclose existence of lawsuit). Thus, “[t]he Federal Rules of Civil Procedure demonstrate a policy in favor of full record retention.” *See Alkaabi v. DHS*, No. 09-5476, 2010 WL 4668337, at \*1 (E.D. La. Nov. 5, 2010) (Fallon, J.) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 79(a)(1)) (denying motion to expunge records that plaintiff had filed a lawsuit).

Although plaintiff asserts that she is presently experiencing adverse consequences as a result of the continued existence of a record of this lawsuit, under these circumstances the Court does not

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Doc. No. 6. Plaintiff filed a similar motion to seal a related case. *See Stone v. La. Dep’t of Revenue*, No. 12-3022 (E.D. La. Dec. 20, 2012), R. Doc. No. 47.


<sup>2</sup>R. Doc. No. 6, at 1.

<sup>3</sup>R. Doc. No. 6-1, at 1.

find that outweighs the general principle that court records should be public, accessible, and unsealed.<sup>4</sup> Nor has plaintiff satisfied Local Rule 5.6 by articulating what specific confidential information should be sealed, or why sealing is necessary or authorized by governing case law. *See* LR 5.6(B). Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**.

New Orleans, Louisiana, October 1, 2014.



\_\_\_\_\_  
**LANCE M. AFRICK**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

---

<sup>4</sup>The Court expresses no opinion whether plaintiff may pursue some other relief based on her belief that potential employers have declined to hire her because of her prior litigation.